

## **REMARKS**

Claims 31-35 and 37 have been amended. Claims 1-11, 13-26, 28-35 and 37 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Section 101 Rejection:**

The Office Action rejected claims 31-35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 31-35 and 37 have been amended to overcome the § 101 rejection and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Section 103(a) Rejection:**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 9, 17, 20 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montero et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0143958) (hereinafter “Montero”) in view of Goldick (U.S. Publication 2003/0093457). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons presented below.

Regarding claim 1, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Montero in view of Goldick does not teach or suggest a distributed store configured to provide locked access to the primary state of session data to a process executing within one of a plurality of application servers, where in providing locked access to the primary state to a process executing within one of the plurality of application servers, the distribute store is configured to send a lock token to the process. The Examiner admits that Montero does not teach a distributed store configured to send a lock token and relies upon Goldick, citing paragraphs 24-25 and 44-45. However, Goldick teaches a system for managing allocation of resources and locks to client computer systems. Goldick’s system includes locking resources and maintaining subscription to lock-related events to effectively allow for asynchronous grants of a lock based on the time of the request to alleviate lock

starvation. Goldick teaches that a server may break an existing lock to prevent lost resources.

However, Goldick does not mention anything about a distributed store sending lock tokens to processes executing within an application server. Instead, Goldick teaches a server that provides requesting *client* computer systems with locked access to resources. Goldick specifically refers to managing access by client computer systems. Goldick's system for managing access to shared resources by client computer systems is very different from a distributed store sending a lock token to a process executing within an application server and from Montero's system for providing periodic storing of session data by multiple application servers. Goldick does not mention anything about sending a lock token to processes executing within an application server. Nor does Goldick have anything to do with providing a plurality of application servers locked access to session data. Additionally, Goldick is not directed toward providing locked access to *session data* at all. Instead, Goldick teaches a system for managing *client* access to shared resources, such as "text documents, application program modules, data objects, properties or attributes for data objects". The shared resources taught by Goldick are very different from session data configured for access by a plurality of application servers. The Examiner has not cited any prior art, either singly or combination, that teaches or suggests a distributed store configured to provide locked access to the primary state of session data to a process executing within one of a plurality of application servers, where in providing locked access to the primary state to a process executing within one of the plurality of application servers, the distribute store is configured to send a lock token to the process.

Additionally, the Examiner's proposed combination of Montero and Goldick would not result in a system that included a distributed store configured to send a lock token to a process executing within one of a plurality of application servers. Instead, the Examiner's combination of Montero and Goldick would result in Montero's back-end database system that includes application servers maintaining session data for clients as taught by Montero, but also allows clients locked access to a server database, based on

providing requesting clients lock tokens, as taught by Goldick. Since, as shown above, neither Montero nor Goldick teaching anything regarding a distributed store configured to send a lock token *to a process executing within one of a plurality of application servers*, no combination of Montero and Goldick would include such functionality. Thus, the Examiner's combination of Montero and Goldick does not teach or suggest all the limitations of Applicants' claim 1. As the Examiner is surely away, to establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP 2143.03. Thus, the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* rejection of claim 1.

Also, the Examiner has failed to provide a proper motivation for combining Montero and Goldick. The Examiner merely states that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Montero with those of Goldick "in order to prevent data inconsistency." However, preventing data inconsistency would only provide motivation for one to use either of systems taught by Montero or Goldick individually, as they both already individually provide methods to prevent data inconsistency. Thus, the Examiner's reasons does not provide any motivation to combine or modify the individual teachings of Montero and/or Goldick. Additionally, as is well known in the art, there are many different ways to prevent data inconsistency. The merely desire to prevent data inconsistency would not in any way suggest or motivate one to modify the teachings of Montero with those of Goldick. As held by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in *Ecolochem Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.*, an obviousness claim that lacks evidence of a suggestion or motivation for one of skill in the art to combine prior art references to produce the claimed invention is defective as hindsight analysis. In addition, the showing of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine prior teachings "must be clear and particular." "Broad conclusory statements regarding the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not 'evidence'." *In re Dembicza*k, 175 F.3d 994, 50 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Furthermore, the Examiner is improperly focusing his arguments only on specific differences between the present invention and the prior art, instead of considering the invention as a whole. The Examiner is arguing the obviousness of including the system for providing client computers with locked access to shared resources as taught by Goldick with the periodic updating by application servers of session data as taught by Montero. However, “the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether in differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious.” *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983). *See also*, M.P.E.P 2141.02. “Most if not all inventions arise from a combination of old elements. *See In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Thus, every element of a claimed invention may often be found in the prior art. *See id.* However, identification in the prior art of each individual part claimed is insufficient to defeat patentability of the whole claimed invention. *See id.*” *In re Werner Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (*emphasis added*).

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the prior art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 17, 20 and 31.

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 13-16, 26, 28-30, 35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montero in view of Bennett (U.S. Patent 5,734,909) and further in view of Bender et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0163494) (hereinafter “Bender”) and further in view of Eshel et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0018785) (hereinafter “Eshel”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons presented below.

Regarding claim 10, Montero in view of Bennet in view of Bender and in further view of Eshel fails to teach or suggest a distributed store configured to request the process to release the locked access, wherein the process is configured to release the

locked access in response to the request. Montero does not teach any sort of locking mechanism, as admitted by the Examiner. Bennet teaches a system in which client requests requiring locked access to a resource already locked are queued until the locked resource is available (Bennet, column 3, line 62 – column 4, line 14). Bender teaches a system in which processes and threads requiring locked access to already locked resources must wait until the process holding locked access to the resource has finished with the resource. The Examiner admits that Montero, Bennet and Bender, either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a distributed store configured to request the process to release the locked access, wherein the process is configured to release the locked access in response to the request.

The Examiner relies upon Eshel, citing paragraphs [0011] and [0012], as well as Fig. 2. However, Eshel does not teach or suggest a distributed store requesting a process release a locked access. Instead, Eshel teaches that the other node requiring locked access, not the server or distributed store, sends a request to a process that holds a lock token for a shared resource. Specifically, at the Examiner's cited passage, Eshel teaches that when the token server receives a request from a node for a token that is current held by another node, the other node needs to relinquish its token and that “[t]his is accomplished by having the lock manager *of the requesting node* send a revoke request to the node holding the token” (Eshel, paragraph [0012]). Thus, Eshel plainly teaches that the requesting node, not the token server or a distributed store, sends a request a process to release a locked access. Additionally, by teaching that the requesting node sends a revoke request to a node that holds a lock token for a shared resource, **Eshel teaches away from a distributed store configured to request a process to release a locked access.**

Also Eshel fails to teach or suggest that the process holding a locked access is configured to release the locked access in response to a request from a distributed store. Instead, Eshel teaches that the node holding a lock token, “checks whether a lock requiring the token is currently held, *waits for any such lock to be released*, and then sends a message to the token server to relinquish the token” (Eshel, paragraph [0012]). Thus, Eshel clearly teaches that a process holding locked access does not release the

locked access in response to a request to release the lock access. Eshel's nodes wait until the lock is released.

Thus, Eshel fails to teach the functionality for which the Examiner relies on Eshel. Since Montero, Bennet, Bender and Eshel all fail to teach or suggest wherein the distributed store is configured to request the process to release the locked access, wherein the process is configured to release the locked access in response to said request, the Examiner's combination of Montero, Bennet, Bender and Eshel also fails to teach or suggest such functionality.

Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to provide a proper motivation to combine the teachings of Eshel with those of Montero, Bennet and Bender. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Eshel with those of Montero "in order to provide the locked access to another node." However, the Examiner stated motivation is merely a reason why one would use the system taught by the background section of Eshel. The desire to provide locked access to another node would not motivate one to modify the teachings of Montero, Bennet or Bender. Additionally, the Examiner's stated motivation amounts to nothing more than stating what the Examiner hopes to achieve by making the combination. Such a conclusory statement does not provide motivation to modify the existing systems of Montero, Bennet and Bender.

For at least the reasons below, the rejection of claim 10 is not supported by the prior art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks apply to claims 26 and 35.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 3, 22 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montero in view of Goldick, and further in view Eshel, et al. (U.S. Publication 2003/0018785) (hereinafter "Eshel"), claims 4, 7, 8 19, 23-25 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montero in view of Goldick, and further in view of Bennett (U.S. Patent 5,734,909), and claims 5, 18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montero in view of Goldick, and further in

view of Bender. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims for at least the reasons presented above regarding their respective independent claims.

Regarding all the § 103 rejections discussed above, Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

## CONCLUSION


Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-11700/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard
- Petition for Extension of Time
- Notice of Change of Address
- Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert  
Reg. No. 39,255  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 20, 2006